

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 and 22-25 are presently pending and stand rejected. Claims 19-21 are cancelled without prejudice. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kono in view of Abelard, and unpatentable over Kono in view of Duruoz.

Claim 1 recites, among other limitations, "determining when to overwrite an existing image in the image buffers, ... and providing a signal to the decoder indicating when to overwrite the existing image in the image buffer; and wherein the decoder overwrites the existing image after receiving the signal; and wherein the decoder overwrites the existing image after receiving the signal". The Office Action indicates that Kono does not teach the foregoing while Duruoz teaches the foregoing at 0028, 0050, 0072, 0077. Office Action at 3-4.

Claim 1 also recites "wherein the decoded images are provided for display in the forward order at normal speed". The Office Action has indicated that "Abelard et al further discloses display in the forward order at normal speed in 0002".

It is noted that Abelard 0028, 0050, 0072, and 0077 lead to display of the pictures in reverse order. See Figure 7. Thus, even if Abelard teaches at 0002 and 0083 the display of pictures in the forward order, the combination proposed in the Office Action is inoperable to

display the pictures in the forward order at normal speed. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection.

Additionally, claim 1 is amended to recite, among other limitations, "wherein determining when to overwrite the existing image further comprises determining when the existing image has finished display for the last time and is no longer needed for decoding other images".

The Office Action at 3 indicates that Kono does not teach "determining when to overwrite an existing image in the image buffers". Although Abelard teaches "means for monitoring the availability for write access of reconstruction buffers ... , wherein the availability of a reconstruction buffer is determined by the *status of display of a picture*", Abelard 0028, Abelard does not teach "wherein determining when to overwrite the existing image further comprises determining when the existing image has finished display for the last time and *is no longer needed for decoding other images*".

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claims 1 and 13 (reciting "wherein indicating when to overwrite the existing image further comprises determining when the existing image has finished display for the last time and is no longer needed for decoding other images") as obvious from the combination of Kono in view of Abelard.

Claim 1 was also rejected from the combination of Kono in view of Duruoz. Claim 1 is amended to recite, among other limitations, "wherein determining when to overwrite the existing image further comprises determining when the

existing image has finished display for the last time and is no longer needed for decoding other images".

Although the Office Action at 16 indicates that Duruoz teaches "determines the order in which fields are to be decoded and when and to where in the buffer memory 78 decoded slices are to be written", the foregoing does not establish that Duruoz teaches "determining when to overwrite an existing image in the image buffers". Moreover, Duruoz clearly does not teach "wherein determining when to overwrite the existing image further comprises determining when the existing image has finished display for the last time and is no longer needed for decoding other images".

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1 and 13 (reciting "wherein indicating when to overwrite the existing image further comprises determining when the existing image has finished display for the last time and is no longer needed for decoding other images") as obvious from Kono in view of Duruoz.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, Assignee respectfully submits all of the pending claims are in a condition for allowance, thereby placing the application in a condition for allowance. It is believed that there is no fee associated with any of the actions requested herein. To the extent that there is any fee associated with any actions requested herein, the Commissioner is requested to charge such fee to deposit account 13-0017.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED



Mirut Dalal - Reg. No. 44,052
ATTORNEY FOR ASSIGNEE

June 3, 2010

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison - Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000
FAX (312) 775-8100